



National Institute of Justice

S o l i c i t a t i o n

Jeremy Travis, Director

April 1998

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program Research and Evaluation Solicitation, 1998

APPLICATION DEADLINE:

July 14, 1998

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20531

Janet Reno
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General

Laurie Robinson
Assistant Attorney General

Noël Brennan
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Jeremy Travis
Director, National Institute of Justice

Department of Justice Response Center:
800-421-6770

Office of Justice Programs
World Wide Web Site:
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>

National Institute of Justice
World Wide Web Site:
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program Research and Evaluation Solicitation

I. Introduction

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is requesting proposals for evaluation and research related to the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) program, which is being administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). It responds to both the congressional and public demand for accountability and the need to develop a knowledge base that examines policy and programmatic experience and continually recommends improvements to them. This initial announcement seeks to support a national evaluation of the implementation of JAIBG; topical research regarding issues of policy raised by the mandates that underlie JAIBG; individual program evaluations; and practitioner-research partnerships to build local capacity in crucial areas of research surrounding the implementation of JAIBG.

II. Background

Public Law 105-119, November 26, 1997, Making Appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1998, and for other Purposes (Appropriations Act) appropriated \$250 million for the JAIBG program described in Title III of H.R. 3, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 8, 1997. Applicants can retrieve the full text of H.R. 3 and the Appropriations Act from the Internet at Congress's web site: <http://thomas.loc.gov>. This site is the official Web Page for the U.S. Congress and contains a searchable database of all bills presently under consideration by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

Under the Appropriations Act, eligibility for States to receive block grants under JAIBG is

based on certification by the Governor (or other chief executive) that the State is actively considering, or will consider within one year from the date of certification, legislation, policies, or practices that, if enacted, would qualify such State for a grant under Section 1802 of H. R. 3. The terms and details of such certification are spelled out in OJJDP's *Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) Program Guidance Manual: FY 1998*. The guidelines are available through OJJDP's Clearinghouse (call 1-800-638-8736) or from OJJDP's Homepage at: <http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm> on the grants and funding page. For eligibility, States must certify that they have undertaken the following:

1. States must consider legislation, policies, or practices to ensure that juveniles who commit an act after attaining 15 years of age that would be a serious violent crime if committed by an adult are treated as adults for purposes of prosecution as a matter of law or that the prosecutor has the authority to determine whether to prosecute such juveniles as adults.
2. States must consider legislation, policies, or practices that impose sanctions on juvenile offenders for every delinquent or criminal act, or violation of probation, ensuring that such sanctions escalate in severity with each subsequent, more serious delinquent or criminal act, or violation of probation including such accountability-based sanctions as restitution, community service, punishment imposed by community accountability councils comprising individuals from the offender's and victim's communities, fines, and short-term confinement.

3. States must consider legislation, policies, or practices to establish, at a minimum, a system of records relating to any adjudication of a juvenile who has a prior delinquency adjudication and who is adjudicated delinquent for conduct that, if committed by an adult, would constitute a felony under Federal or State law, which is a system equivalent to that maintained for adults who commit felonies under Federal or State law. States must also consider making such records available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in a manner equivalent to the one used for adult records.

4. States must consider legislation, policies, or practices to ensure that State law does not prevent a juvenile court judge from issuing a court order against a parent, guardian, or custodian of a juvenile offender regarding the supervision of such an offender and from imposing sanctions for a violation of such an order.

The Appropriation language adds another stipulation to receive the block grant award:

5. In addition to consideration of the four areas of certification listed above, the Appropriations Act also requires that a State or unit of local government, to be determined eligible to receive a JAIBG award or subgrant, must have implemented, or agree to implement by January 1, 1999, a policy of testing appropriate categories of juveniles within the juvenile justice system for use of controlled substances. The categories of juveniles that are “appropriate” for testing shall be determined by the Chief Executive Officer of the State certifying compliance or by the applicant unit of local government.

H. R. 3 further provides for the passthrough of the block grant funds from the States to units of local government. Absent a waiver, each State shall distribute not less than 75 percent of the State’s allocation received among all units of local government in the State. In making such distribution, the State shall allocate to each unit of local government an amount, by formula, based on a combination of law enforcement expenditures for each unit of local government and the average annual number of Uniform Crime Report part 1 violent crimes reported by each unit of local government for the three most recent calendar years for which data are available. A State may request a waiver for the 75 percent passthrough to units of local government if the State demonstrates that it bears the primary financial burden (more than 50 percent) for the administration of juvenile justice within that State. [For more specifics on the passthrough requirements, formulas, and waiver see OJJDP’s *Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) Program Guidance Manual: FY 1998.*]

Of the \$250 million, \$5.25 million (2.1%) has been set aside for administration; \$7.5 million (3%) has been set aside for research and evaluation, and demonstration programs; and \$5 million (2%) for training and technical assistance. The remainder, \$232.25 million (92.9%), has been allocated to the States for block grants based first on a minimum award of 0.5% of available funds to each eligible “State,” with the balance of funds distributed on the basis of relative State population under the age of 18, to meet the twelve program goals referenced in *Appendix B* according to the stipulations given in H. R. 3.

Within the 3% set aside for research and evaluation, two specific requirements must be supported. The first is a national assessment of the supply of, and demand for, juvenile detention space requirements with particular emphasis on capacity requirements in Alaska, California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, South Carolina, West Virginia, and

Wisconsin with a report to be submitted to Congress by July 15, 1998. The second requirement calls for a study of the “overall effectiveness and efficiency of the (administrative) provisions of JAIBG in assuring compliance with its provisions, and for administrative costs to carry out its purposes. The research efforts described above will be carried out by OJJDP separately from this solicitation.

Additionally, funds from the 3% set-aside have been made available for use by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the States’ Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs) for research efforts designed to enhance understandings about the processing and status of juvenile offenders. Finally, \$2.75 million has been transferred to the National Institute of Justice to support the three-tiered research effort described below.

III. Areas of Research Required

In order to understand fully the impact of JAIBG on juvenile justice systems and the children they serve, NIJ and OJJDP have formulated a comprehensive evaluation strategy to assess and evaluate major Federal initiatives intended to have a direct local impact. This is a multi-tiered research and evaluation approach, consisting of the following three “tiers” of research efforts:

A. **A national evaluation**, designed to provide information about the process of implementation and the local impact of the JAIBG funding. One award for up to \$500,000 is expected to be made, for a period of up to two years.

B. **Topical research or evaluation** at the State or local level, the purpose of which is to examine promising strategies or programs or significant policy and procedural approaches that would support or be central to the implementation of the juvenile accountability initiative. Six awards of up to \$200,000 each are expected to be made, for a period of up to two years.

C. **Researcher-practitioner partnerships**, at the State or local level, designed to enhance the research and evaluation capability of practitioners

by supporting the creation of partnerships between research organizations and operational agencies to carry out related research and evaluation activities. Ten awards of up to \$75,000 each are expected to be made, for a period of up to fifteen months.

Each of these tiers is defined in a separate section of this solicitation. Each section presents the general scope of work desired, issues that should be addressed in the application, and the overall amount of funds available and number of awards expected. Applicants should indicate the specific section for which they are applying by including within their title item 11 on application form 424.

A. National Evaluation

The language of H. R. 3 requires an evaluation of JAIBG. This project would undertake such an evaluation according to the specific language contained in H. R. 3:

“specifically, this project would evaluate how the JAIBG funds are spent and how effectively or efficiently the State and local units of government spend the funds.”

The funds appropriated for JAIBG are to be distributed to States and local units of government through a detailed and elaborate spending formula. The actual amount of funds that became available at the local level, the manner of disbursement, the actual systems-level impact, and the degree to which practitioners felt that the JAIBG funds or funding mechanism encouraged or hindered development of local initiatives need to be documented. OJJDP and NIJ are interested in collecting information at the national, state, and local level about **administrative issues** (e.g., the systems by which funding disbursement were made and how the determination of “active consideration” was made); **programmatic impacts** of the JAIBG funds (what the monies actually provided at the state and local level); and **practitioner and policymaker attitudes** about the structure and process of the initiative (how those involved with

allocating and receiving the funds felt that JAIBG helped or hindered their responsibilities). Some suggested questions that should be addressed by the national evaluation include **but are not limited to** the following:

A. Administrative Issues:

- Describe the mechanism by which JAIBG funds were allocated and channeled. How much was received, at the state level and locally? Within each State, what unit of local government(s) actually received funds? Were these funds bundled with others? What were the benefits of this structure or system, if any? What were the problems, if any?
- How fast were the disbursements made?
- What waivers to the requirements of 75% local disbursement were made? What was allowed? What reasons were offered for the need for waivers?
- What was the impact of setting limits on the percentage of funds that could be allocated for specific program areas? Were certifications provided? By States? Units of local government? What reasons were given for certification?
- What documentation did States present regarding “active consideration” of the four mandated areas (prosecution of serious juveniles, graduated sanctions, access to juvenile arrest information, and custodial orders)?
- What legal or statutory requirements regarding these four areas were in place prior to the JAIBG initiative? (That is, what type of filing statutes, sanctioning approaches, information sharing, or custodial supervision authority was in place before the JAIBG?)

- What changes were put into place as a result of “active consideration” of these four areas?
- What State/local drug testing policies were in place prior to JAIBG? What changes were put in place as a result of the requirement to implement a drug testing policy? Were interventions put in place?

B. Programmatic Issues:

- Given the structure of H.R. 3 regarding the expenditure of funds within the twelve program areas referenced in *Appendix B*, what were the immediate short-range objectives of these funds at the state and local level?
- For what were the JAIBG funds used (e.g., for what types of staff, operations, programs, or technology were the funds used)?
- Did these funds provide for new staff, operations, programs, or technology? Did they enhance existing resources, systems, or programs?
- What is the potential for long-range impacts or outcomes, and what are those outcomes?

C. Practitioner and Policymaker Attitudes

- Were there specific barriers presented in the JAIBG structure, either in the funding allocation mechanism or the prescriptive nature of the expenditures allowed?
- What was the opinion of practitioners and policymakers about the funds available through JAIBG? Did they believe that the funds could and did enhance their activities? Did they feel constrained by the stipulations? If so, in what way?

- Did the funds act as an incentive for increasing “accountability-based juvenile processing” at the local level? If so, in what way?
- Were there unanticipated outcomes (either positive or negative) for other parts of the system because of JAIBG? If any occurred, what were they?

To participate in JAIBG, each State will have to report to the State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD) of OJJDP. SRAD will have available data such as that described in *Appendix A*. Applicants should describe the data they will collect in relation to the Federal data. Further, applicants should describe the type of relationships between various units of government they believe necessary to facilitate the national evaluation. The applicant should detail how specific information, such as perspectives on implementation processes, successes, and shortcomings would be collected; what data sources would be used; and describe what analytic methods would be used.

In addition to providing information at a national level, applicants should discuss whether an intensive focus on a mix of sites, varying by purpose area, population served, and geography, might be useful and how such an analysis might be conducted in the relatively limited time frame for this project (up to 24 months).

OJJDP and NIJ are also interested in expeditious and innovative methods for disseminating the findings from this effort, to supplement the more traditional dissemination approaches and facilitate the rapid dissemination of findings and innovations. Further, the successful grantee would be expected to supply detailed semi-annual

progress reports, and to participate in other feedback to NIJ as agreed upon at the time of the award. The applicant should describe how normal dissemination would be enhanced and should specify the types of information that would be available to OJJDP and NIJ at specific points during the project.

NIJ expects to award one grant for an amount not to exceed \$500,000, for a time period not to exceed 24 months.

B. Topical Research or Evaluation Projects

While the funding structure given in H.R. 3 allocates percentages and general groups of items within which funds must be spent (i.e., not less than 45% must be designated for purpose areas 3 through 9, presented in *Appendix B*; and not less than 35% for purpose areas 1, 2, and 10), there is no guidance concerning which specific approach or combination of approaches would result in the best juvenile justice system improvement. OJJDP and NIJ are interested in funding specific research or evaluation efforts that will help improve the knowledge base of concern to practitioners in juvenile justice, such as juvenile versus adult court processing; correctional practices and youthful offenders; programming for serious offenders; graduated accountability-based sanctions, and performance measurement. Topics such as the following are of interest:

- Risk and/or needs-based classification instruments.
- Innovative prosecutorial strategies.
- Specialized courts.

-
- Impact of prosecuting juveniles in adult court on offenders, judicial and correctional systems, and society.
 - Impact of blended sentences on offenders, judicial and correctional systems, and society.
 - Implementation of graduated sanctions in an accountability-based system.
 - Impact of the use of graduated sanctions on offenders and the criminal justice system.
 - Impact of correctional programming on juveniles, either in adult or juvenile facilities.
 - Evaluations of innovative program strategies.
 - Models for information sharing.
 - Performance measurement in monitoring, assessment, and evaluation.
 - Cost analyses and cost effectiveness studies.

Other topics are encouraged. The scope of research and evaluation of interest under this section of the solicitation extends from juvenile arrest and detention to aftercare and includes both management approaches and offender-based programs or systems issues. In addition to technical merit, award decisions will be strongly influenced by determinations of potential policy relevance as it relates to effective and appropriate implementation of the stipulations of H.R. 3. As such, applicants bear the responsibility of articulating to peer reviewers the contributions to the implementation of accountability-based sanctions of their proposed research.

C. Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships

An essential part of the overall evaluation strategy is to encourage and support the development of improved research and evaluation capacity within State and local criminal justice systems. Recognizing that most operational agencies neither have nor can afford substantial in-house research and evaluation expertise, this solicitation is encouraging the formation of partnerships between agencies and research institutions, the purpose of which is to stimulate collaborative efforts with the goal of developing lasting relationships. **Agencies and researchers must develop and submit collaborative applications.**

It is a goal of this section of the solicitation to facilitate the development of practitioner-researcher collaborations who will design and carry out research efforts of use to the juvenile justice system. The kinds of projects that might be developed should expand juvenile justice system capacity regarding accountability-based systems and processing for juveniles or provide for the development of “best practice” or “model program” information to courts and corrections as they implement accountability-based approaches. Suggested topics that applicant partnerships may propose include but are not limited to the following:

- Development of methodologies for problem identification or the application of such methods.
- Specification of techniques or applications of approaches to determine optimal solution identification.
- Program measurement or performance measures development.

-
- Identification and analysis of data elements necessary for evaluation of key programmatic efforts.
 - Development of program outcome evaluation designs.

Applicants may be either research or practitioner organizations, and they must demonstrate that they have established a working relationship among research organizations, State or local practitioners, policy makers, or other juvenile justice officials relevant to the project proposed for research. Written evidence of the collaboration must be provided in the proposal. Researchers may be from academic institutions, non-profit or governmental research organizations, or profit-making organizations willing to waive their fee. Applicants should provide a description of the history of their partnership, and demonstrate the likelihood that it will be sustained after conclusion of federal funding. The project proposed should be directed toward serving both the individual project(s) and the larger national interest of informing other jurisdictions of effective and innovative methodologies, techniques, or approaches.

IV. How To Apply

Those interested in submitting proposals in response to this solicitation must complete the required application forms and submit related required documents. (See below for how to obtain application forms and guides for completing proposals.) Applicants must include the following information/forms to qualify for consideration:

- Standard Form (SF) 424—application for Federal assistance
- Assurances

- Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (one form)
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities
- Budget Detail Worksheet
- Budget Narrative
- Negotiated indirect rate agreement (if appropriate)
- Names and affiliations of all key persons from applicant and subcontractor(s), advisors, consultants, and advisory board members. Include name of principal investigator, title, organizational affiliation (if any), department (if institution of higher education), address, phone, and fax.
- Proposal abstract
- Table of contents
- Program narrative or technical proposal
- Privacy certificate
- References
- Letters of cooperation from organizations collaborating in the research project
- Résumés
- Appendixes, if any (e.g., list of previous NIJ awards, their status, and products [in NIJ or other publications])

Proposal abstract. The proposal abstract, when read separately from the rest of the application, is meant to serve as a succinct and accurate description of the proposed work. Applicants must concisely describe the research goals and objectives, research design, and methods for achieving the goals and objectives. Summaries of past accomplishments are to be avoided, and proprietary/confidential information is not to be included. Length is not to exceed 400 words. Use the following two headers:

Project Goals and Objectives:

Proposed Research Design and Methodology:

Page limit. The number of pages in the “Program Narrative” part of the proposal must not exceed 30 (double-spaced pages) for awards of \$50,000 or more; for smaller awards (under \$50,000), the maximum page length is 15 (double-spaced pages).

Due date. Completed proposals **must be received** at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on July 14, 1998. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

Award period. In general, NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 12 or 24 months. However, longer budget periods may be considered.

Number of awards. NIJ anticipates supporting one award for the national evaluation; six awards for the topical research or evaluation; and ten awards for the partnership section under this solicitation.

Award amount. Awards totaling up to \$500,000 for the national evaluation, up to \$200,000 for each award in the topical research or evaluation section, and up to \$75,000 for each award in the partnership section will be made available for this NIJ solicitation.

Applying. Two packets need to be obtained: (1) application forms (including a sample budget worksheet) and (2) guidelines for submitting proposals (including requirements for proposal writers and requirements for grant recipients). To receive them, applicants can:

- Access the Justice Information Center on the web:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/fedgrant.htm#NIJ>

or the NIJ web site:

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/NIJ/funding.htm>

These web sites offer the NIJ application forms and guidelines as electronic files that may be downloaded to a personal computer.
- Request hard copies of the forms and guidelines by mail from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 800–851–3420 or from the Department of Justice Response Center at 800–421–6770 (in the Washington, D.C., area, at 202–307–1480).
- Request copies by fax. Call 800–851–3420 and select option 1, then option 1 again for NIJ. Code is 1023.

Guidance and information. Applicants who wish to receive additional guidance and information may contact the Department of Justice Response Center at 800–421–6770. Center staff can provide assistance or refer applicants to an appropriate NIJ professional. Applicants may, for example, wish to discuss their prospective research topics with the NIJ professional staff.

Send completed forms to:

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant
Program Research and Evaluation Solicitation

National Institute of Justice

810 Seventh Street N.W.

Washington, DC 20531

[overnight courier ZIP code 20001]

Appendix A

The State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD) of OJJDP will receive from State agencies designated to administer the JAIBG the following program information regarding the utilization of program funds by the State and units of local government:

- 1) Name of the recipient of funds (i.e. State agency or unit of local government name);
- 2) Amount of grant/subgrant;
- 3) Makeup of Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition;
- 4) Amount of award dispersed to each program purpose area;
- 5) An explanation of how it was determined that the interests of public safety and juvenile crime control would be better served by expending the funds in a proportion other than the prescribed 45 and 35 percent minimums (45% in purpose areas 3-9 and 35% in purpose areas 1,2 & 10, as shown in Appendix B).

In addition to the above information, the designated State agency will submit semi-annual progress reports providing general information on progress toward implementation of the JAIBG program.

APPENDIX B

JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY INCENTIVE BLOCK GRANT

PURPOSE AREAS

1. Building, expanding, renovating, or operating temporary or permanent juvenile correction or detention facilities; including the training of correctional personnel.
2. Developing and administering accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders;
3. Hiring additional juvenile judges, probation officers, and court-appointed defenders, and funding pre-trial services for juveniles, to ensure the smooth and expeditious administration of the juvenile justice system.
4. Hiring additional prosecutors so that more cases involving violent juvenile offenders can be prosecuted and backlogs reduced;
5. Providing funding to technology, equipment and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders;
6. Providing funding for technology, equipment and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders;
7. Providing funding to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation offices to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism;
8. The establishment of court-based juvenile justice programs that target young firearms offenders through the establishment of juvenile gun courts for the adjudication and prosecution of juvenile firearms offenders;
9. The establishment of drug court programs for juveniles so as to provide continuing judicial supervision over juvenile offenders with substance abuse problems and to provide the integrated administration of other sanctions and services;
10. Establishing and maintaining interagency information-sharing programs that enable the juvenile and criminal justice system, schools, and social services agencies to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent or criminal acts;
11. Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that work with the juvenile offenders who are referred by law enforcement agencies, or which are designed, in cooperation with law enforcement officials, to protect students and school personnel from drug, gang, and youth violence;
12. In addition, the Appropriations Act provides that funds may be expended to implement a State or local policy of controlled substance testing for appropriate categories of juveniles within the juvenile justice system.

To find out more information about the National Institute of Justice, please contact:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service

Box 6000

Rockville, MD 20849-6000

800-851-3420

e-mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.org

To obtain an electronic version of this document, access
the NIJ web site (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>).

If you have any questions, call or e-mail NCJRS.